REMARKS

In the May 10, 2010 Final Office Action, all of the claims stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 10, 2010 Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 1, as indicated above. Thus, claims 1, 3 and 5-9 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,245,182 (hereinafter the "Nakamura patent") in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0098326 (hereinafter the "Sato et al. publication"). In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the heat-curing agent is free of compounds containing one or more isocyanate groups ***and*** includes a ***chelate compound***. In other words, Applicant has deleted all elements of the Markush group of the heat-curing agent, except that the heat-curing agent includes a ***chelate compound***. Hence, no new issues are raised by the above amendments to claim 1.

At the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action acknowledges that the Nakamura patent teaches the ***inclusion*** of a polyfunctional isocyanate. However, the Nakamura patent fails to disclose or suggest the use of chelate compounds as a heat-curing agent.

Similarly, the Sato et al. publication also discloses the use of isocyanate compounds but ***fails*** to disclose or suggest the use of chelate compounds as a heat-curing agent. The Sato et al. publication explicitly teaches that ***specific*** cross-linking agents are used with ***specific*** types of resin materials but makes no mention or suggestion of the use of a chelate compound.

Claim 1 ***recites*** a heat-curing agent that is ***free of compounds containing one or more isocyanate groups*** and further recites that the heat-curing agent includes a ***chelate compound***.

Hence, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of the Nakamura patent with the Sato et al. publication, one would still fail to achieve the claimed invention.

Under U.S. patent law, the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does ***not*** make the modification obvious, unless an ***apparent reason*** exists based on evidence in the record or scientific reasoning for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the modification. See, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). The KSR Court noted that obviousness cannot be proven merely by showing that the elements of a claimed device were known in the prior art; it must be shown that those of ordinary skill in the art would have had some "apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed." Id. at 1741. The current record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create Applicants' unique arrangement of a resin compound.

Moreover, Applicant believe that dependent claims 3 and 5-9 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 3 and 5-9 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believe that since the

prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 3 and 5-9 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Robbins/
John C. Robbins
Reg. No. 34,706

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: August 5, 2010

S:\08-AUG10-SOS\KE-US040474 Amendment FOA August 2010.doc